

### **REMARKS**

The Applicants respectfully request further examination and consideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 18, 20-24 and 28-33 were pending in this application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 18, 20-24 and 28-33 have been rejected. By the above amendment, Claims 22 and 24 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 18, 20-24 and 28-33 are currently pending in this application.

#### **Priority**

Within the Office Action, it is stated that a statement reading "This is a continuation of Application No. 10/218,404, filed August 12, 2002" should be entered in the specification. By the above amendment, such a statement has been added to the specification.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Within the Office Action, Claims 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. Specifically, it is stated within the Office Action that Claim 22 is indefinite because the body of the claim merely provides some elements, but fails to provide any assembly steps. By the above amendment, Claim 22 has been amended to specify coupling the clasp mechanism to a cylindrical member and coupling a drive unit to the cylindrical member. Accordingly, Claim 22 does provide assembly steps.

It is further stated within the Office Action that within Claim 22 clause b. has awkward wording and "the cylindrical member" lacks antecedent basis. By the above amendment, Claim 22 has been amended to provide the antecedent basis for "the cylindrical member in line 5 and the awkward wording has been amended to "coupling a drive unit."

#### **Non-Statutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection**

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 18, 20, 21 and 22-24 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Specifically, Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 18, 20, 21 and 22-24 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-4, 6-8-15, 17, 19-22 and 25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,739,220. The Applicants are filing a terminal disclaimer herewith to

obviate this double patenting rejection over U.S. Patent No. 6,739,220. Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 18, 20, 21 and 22-24 are allowable.

For the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,  
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: March 23, 2005

By: Jonathan O. Owens  
Jonathan O. Owens  
Reg. No. 37,902  
Attorneys for Applicants

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP.**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_